



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/569,492	02/27/2006	Nobuo Naito	127199	3472

25944 7590 11/03/2010  
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC  
P.O. BOX 320850  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER
----------

CHANG, VICTOR S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1788

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

11/03/2010

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com  
jarmstrong@oliff.com

Art Unit: 1788

**NOTE**

1. Applicants argue at Remarks page 2:

“Claim 4 recites two separate components: (1) a coloring agent for color tone correction and (2) an optional coloring agent for color tone adjustment. The element (2) a coloring agent for color tone adjustment is then made a required element in claim 5. These coloring agents are different, and are specifically defined in the specification”.

However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have interpreted the term “correction” and “adjustment” interchangeably equivalent. It is axiomatic that limitations in the specification are not to be read into the claims. *In re Etter*, 756 F.2d 852, 858 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Applicants may wish to clarify their distinctions in composition, if there is any, in the next reply. It should be noted that the same composition in chemistry would inherently provide the same functions.

2. Applicants argue at pages 3-4:

“Yoshikawa and Ozawa at least fail to teach, suggest, or give any reason or rationale to provide that the anti-reflection film includes a separate specific-wavelength-light absorbing layer that is laminated to the near infrared rays absorbing layer on the side opposite to the transparent substrate film and is outside the near infrared rays absorbing layer, as claimed, where this specific-wavelength-light absorbing layer contains an adhesive and a coloring agent for color tone correction that absorbs light with specific wavelengths originating from the emission spectrum of an insert gas of a plasma display and optionally a coloring agent for color tone adjustment. This arrangement of the separate specific-wavelength-light absorbing layer, and the advantages provided thereby, are not disclosed or suggested by Yoshikawa or Ozawa.”

However, since Ozawa’s invention relates to a filter for plasma display panel, and teaches that the filter can have additional layers, such as a near-infrared (IR) absorbing layer, an antireflection layer, and the like. These layers may be provided in an arbitrary order. See col. 15, ll. 27-32. It would have been an obvious modification to one of ordinary skill in the art to

Art Unit: 1788

modify Yosikawa with an additional layer, which consists of a near infrared absorbing agent in a transparent resin, between the transparent substrate and the adhesive layer which consists of a coloring agent for color tone correction, as taught by Ozawa. The examiner asserts that the arrangement of separate specific-wavelength-light absorbing layer of the claimed invention is rendered obvious by the collective teachings of prior art.

Applicants' argument directed to Yoshikawa individually at pages 4-5 ignores the rejection is 103 based, not a 102 rejection.

Applicants' argument at page 6:

“the claimed structure provides significant and unexpected results that are also not taught or suggested by Yoshikawa and Ozawa.”

However, since the collective teachings of prior art renders the structure and composition of the claimed invention obvious, and they have the same required properties for the same end use (an anti-reflection film for a plasma display), it is inconceivable that the results are unexpected.

/Victor S Chang/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1788